

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

ERIBERTO RODRIGUEZ, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

CITY OF PHILADELPHIA, et al.,

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION  
NO. 14-4435

**ORDER**

**AND NOW**, this 18th day of June 2018, upon consideration of TriMark Corporation's ("TriMark") Motion for Reconsideration, Entry of a Separate Judgment, or Leave to Appeal (Doc. No. 146), Tesor Plus Corporation ("Tesor") and Pilock Corporation's ("Pilock") Response in Opposition to TriMark's Motion (Doc. No. 147), TriMark's Reply (Doc. No. 151) and in accordance with the Opinion issued this day, it is **ORDERED** that the Motion (Doc. No. 146) is **GRANTED IN PART** and **DENIED IN PART** as follows:

- 1) TriMark's Motion for Reconsideration and its request to transfer its Third-Party Complaint against Tesor and Pilock to the Northern District of Iowa are **DENIED**.
- 2) The Court finding no just reason for delay in the entry of a separate judgment with respect to the Court Order entered October 31, 2017, TriMark's Motion is **GRANTED** on its request for entry of judgment against only Third-Party Defendants Tesor and Pilock pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(b).
- 3) The Clerk of Court shall **ENTER** a final entry of judgment pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(b) in favor of Third-Party Defendants Tesor Plus Corporation and

Pilock Corporation and against Third-Party Plaintiff TriMark Corporation in accordance with the October 31, 2017 Court Order dismissing Tesor and Pilock.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Joel H. Slomsky, J.  
JOEL H. SLOMSKY, J.